



**SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL**

Planning Committee

16 September 2021



Additional Information Report

This report sets out additional information in relation to planning applications for consideration at the Planning Committee on 16 September 2021 that was received after the Agenda was published.

S21/1201

Proposal: Submission of details reserved by conditions 2 (historic building record) and 5 (landscaping) of S21/0113 (Reserved matters application for details relating to external appearance, layout, scale, and landscaping, with associated open space and infrastructure for the erection of 373 new dwellings, pursuant to Outline Planning Permission under application ref: SK.94/0125/12.)

Site Address: Land South of Harvey Close and West of Wincanton Way, Elsea Park, Bourne

Summary of Information Received:

1. Hard landscaping plan drawing no. BW230EC_PL-02_Rev G
2. A letter accompanied by 162 signatories that was read out at a Public meeting in Bourne on 19 August 2021 setting out why it is considered Bridge 234 should be retained.
3. A letter from the editor of the Railway Heritage magazine setting out why the bridge should be retained.

Officer comments:

The hard landscaping plan includes details of boundary treatments, car parking layouts, hard surfacing materials, including those for cycleways and footpaths. These further details of hard landscaping for the wider development are considered to be acceptable and would ensure the development assimilates with its surroundings and provides a high standard of amenity and would be in accordance with Local Plan policy DE1. The plan also shows appropriate surfacing for roads, cycle and footpaths as well as appropriate car parking layouts in accordance with Local Plan policy DE1 and ID2.

The proposed hard landscaping details are in accordance with the landscaping masterplan drawing no. PR205-01 C that was approved as part of reserved matters application S21/0113 and a requirement of the condition. The full requirements of condition 5 have now been submitted for the whole site covered by reserved matters approval S21/0113 and it is recommended that condition 5 can be discharged in full.

The letter accompanied by 162 signatories sets-out why it is considered that bridge 234 should be retained and includes references to five policies and other legislation as follows:

- SKDC new Local Plan
- SKDC Core Strategy EN1
- Government NPPF
- Community in Planning
- Human Rights Act 1998

The officer assessment of the pocket park aspect of the proposal is set-out in the main report at section 10.2 and section 3 of the addendum report. The officer conclusion is that the plans for the proposed pocket park are in accordance with the approved layout plans and that an appropriate balance is struck between providing a high quality public open space and respecting the heritage value of bridge 234, in accordance with Local Plan Policies DE1, EN6 and OS1.

The SKDC Core Strategy has been superseded by the Local Plan and therefore is not relevant to current decision making. There are no relevant policies in the NPPF that are considered to conflict with the policies in the Local Plan in terms of assessing the proposed pocket park. As noted in the addendum report, whilst there is significant public interest and support for retaining the bridge, it has no statutory protection through listing, and neither the outline nor reserved matters consents require its retention. Further, its removal would not require express planning permission and this is a relevant material planning consideration.

The letter references a 'Community in Planning' document and the Human Rights Act in terms of adequate consultation and fair decision making. Both the reserved matters application S21/0113 and this discharge of conditions application have been subject to appropriate consultation as set-out by the Council's statement of community involvement and relevant legislation. Further, both applications have required determination by Planning Committee with opportunities for public speaking. As such, it is considered that both applications have been subject to adequate and appropriate consultation and fair decision making processes.

The letter from Railway Heritage magazine sets-out why they consider bridge 234 should be retained and includes potential funding options to cover the restoration. The cost of retaining the bridge or how it could be achieved is not a material planning consideration and the officer assessment of relevant development plan policies and other material considerations is set-out in the main report and addendum.

The additional representations do not raise any new material planning considerations beyond those considered in the main report and addendum. The officer recommendation is that the details submitted in relation to conditions 2 (historic building record) and 5 (landscaping) of S21/0113 are acceptable and the development should be implemented in accordance with these details.